

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION

Case No. 5:15-CR-00166-M

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

AKIN SEAN EL PRECISE BEY,

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on Defendant's pro se "Motion to Correct Federal Bureau of Prisons Non-Factual Information Interred into Inmate's Central File" [DE 502]. Defendant requests that "all Non-Factual Information and Comments [be] excluded, and ERASED from my Central File." *Id.* at 1. However, Defendant provides no argument nor information demonstrating this court's authority to order the exclusion of any information or documents from a prison facility's file system, and this court has found no support for Defendant's request.<sup>1</sup> Such administrative matters are specifically within the province of the prison facility. *See Scott v. Mathena*, No. 7:12-CV-00469, 2012 WL 4891711, at \*2 (W.D. Va. Oct. 15, 2012) ("Involving a federal court in the day-to-day administration of a prison is a course the judiciary generally disapproves of taking."); *see also Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 548 n.29 (1979) ("courts should defer to the informed discretion of prison administrators because the realities of running a corrections institution are complex and difficult, courts are ill equipped to deal with these

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent that the motion may be construed to raise an argument or claim under any statute, constitution, rule, or case law, the court notes the Defendant's statement: "I Respectfully ask that my Motion is not construed as me trying to argue my case." DE 502 at 1.

problems, and the management of these facilities is confided to the Executive and Legislative Branches, not to the Judicial Branch.”).

Even if a court had authority to do as Defendant asks, this court finds Defendant has not proceeded as required by law, including failing to file a separate action, failing to demonstrate he has exhausted available administrative remedies under the Prison Litigation Reform Act, and failing to file such request in the proper court (i.e., his current facility is located in Terre Haute, Indiana).

Accordingly, the Defendant’s motion is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this 17<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2023.



RICHARD E. MYERS II  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE